

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

TRACI SPRINGS,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 4:25-cv-403-JDK-JDL
	§	
JUDGE LINDSEY WYNNE, et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Traci Springs, proceeding pro se and requesting to proceed *in forma pauperis*, filed this lawsuit against Defendants on April 21, 2025. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition of the action.

On April 25, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docket Nos. 3; 8) be denied and that Plaintiff's claims for declaratory and injunctive relief be dismissed without prejudice as barred by the *Younger* abstention doctrine. Docket No. 11. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and the time to do so has passed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law.

Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not file any objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 5) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docket Nos. 3; 8) are **DENIED**. Plaintiff's claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are **DISMISSED** without prejudice as barred by the *Younger* abstention doctrine. But Plaintiff's claims for monetary damages remain pending, and Plaintiff's amended complaint is due no later than **July 23, 2025**. *See* Docket No. 20.

So ordered and signed on this

Jun 25, 2025


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE